48A C.J.S. Judges § 275

Corpus Juris Secundum | August 2023 Update

Judges

Joseph Bassano, J.D.; Khara Singer-Mack, J.D.; Thomas Muskus, J.D; Karl Oakes, J.D. and Jeffrey J. Shampo, J.D.

- IX. Disqualification to Act
- C. Grounds for Disqualification
- 2. Interest and Relationship
- a. Interest
- (1) General Considerations

§ 275. Generally

Topic Summary | References | Correlation Table

West's Key Number Digest

West's Key Number Digest, Judges 42

A judge is disqualified from acting in a cause where the judge has an interest in the subject matter of the suit.

Ordinarily, a person cannot be judge of the person's own cause, ¹ and such principle has been so long and well recognized that it is regarded as a maxim of law. ² As a general rule, sometimes by virtue of constitutional or statutory provisions, an interest in the subject matter of a suit will disqualify a judge from acting therein. ³ The rule is subject to exceptions in cases of necessity ⁴ as where a judge is required to participate in a decision, notwithstanding a personal interest, if there is no other judge available to hear and decide the case. ⁵ The type of interest that requires recusal

cannot be defined with precision.⁶ The interest which will disqualify a judge from trying a case depends on the circumstances and relationships,⁷ and in various instances, a judge's interest has been held not to require a disqualification.⁸

Statutes disqualifying judges on the ground of interest are absolute,⁹ mandatory,¹⁰ and jurisdictional.¹¹ They will be liberally construed.¹² It is beyond the scope of legislative authority to confer on a party to a controversy or one interested therein, the power to act as judge in such cause.¹³

Westlaw. © 2023 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. U.S. Govt. Works.

Footnotes U.S.—In re Murchison, 349 U.S. 133, 75 S. Ct. 623, 99 L. Ed. 942 (1955). Tex.—Wythe II Corp. v. Stone, 342 S.W.3d 96 (Tex. App. Beaumont 2011), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 1150, 181 L. Ed. 2d 1020 (2012). Fla.—State v. Chillingworth, 95 Fla. 699, 116 So. 633 (1928). 2 W. Va.—Williams v. Brannen, 116 W. Va. 1, 178 S.E. 67 (1935). U.S.—Sao Paulo State of Federative Republic of Brazil v. American Tobacco Co., Inc., 535 U.S. 229, 122 3 S. Ct. 1290, 152 L. Ed. 2d 346 (2002); In re Murchison, 349 U.S. 133, 75 S. Ct. 623, 99 L. Ed. 942 (1955). N.Y.—Maron v. Silver, 14 N.Y.3d 230, 899 N.Y.S.2d 97, 925 N.E.2d 899 (2010). 4 U.S.—U. S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 101 S. Ct. 471, 66 L. Ed. 2d 392 (1980). Alaska-Hudson v. Johnstone, 660 P.2d 1180 (Alaska 1983). Necessity obviating rule against disqualification, generally, see § 235. A.L.R. Library Construction and Application of Rule of Necessity in Judicial Actions, Providing that a Judge Is Not Disqualified to Try a Case Because of Personal Interest If Case Cannot Be Heard Otherwise, 27 A.L.R.6th U.S.—U. S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 101 S. Ct. 471, 66 L. Ed. 2d 392 (1980). 5 Wis.—State v. O'Neill, 2003 WI App 73, 261 Wis. 2d 534, 663 N.W.2d 292 (Ct. App. 2002). 6 U.S.—In re Murchison, 349 U.S. 133, 75 S. Ct. 623, 99 L. Ed. 942 (1955); U. S. ex rel. Perry v. Cuyler, 7 584 F.2d 644 (3d Cir. 1978). Del.—Matushefske v. Herlihy, 59 Del. 117, 214 A.2d 883 (1965).

As to nature and degree of interest, see §§ 277 to 279.

Relationship as ground for disqualification, see §§ 289 to 297.

8	U.S.—Laird v. Tatum, 409 U.S. 824, 93 S. Ct. 7, 34 L. Ed. 2d 50 (1972), (per Mr. Justice Rehnquist, no motion to recuse).
	Pa.—Smith v. York County, 37 Pa. Commw. 47, 388 A.2d 1149 (1978).
9	N.Y.—Di Lodovico v. Dotson, 1 Misc. 2d 505, 151 N.Y.S.2d 469 (County Ct. 1956).
10	U.S.—McBride v. Galaxy Carpet Mills, Inc., 920 F. Supp. 1278 (N.D. Ga. 1995).
11	N.Y.—Casterella v. Casterella, 65 A.D.2d 614, 409 N.Y.S.2d 548 (2d Dep't 1978).
12	Idaho—Bentley v. Lucky Friday Extension Min. Co., 70 Idaho 511, 223 P.2d 947 (1950).
13	Fla.—State v. Thomas, 99 Fla. 562, 126 So. 747 (1930).

End of Document

© 2023 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.